

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 1 and 10 have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 4-6 and 13-15 "claim determining the forces that are applied to the glyph based upon an amount of coverage of a set of pixels of an array of pixels which is described by the specification for the spring force model, see page 6, lines 20-31, but is not described by the specification for the force-density model and the gravity well model."

Applicant submits that the Examiner is mistaken. As noted by the Examiner, the spring force model is described in the specification on page 6, lines 19-31. However, the gravity well model is described in the specification on page 7, lines 1-5. Although not in the same detail as that of the spring force model, Applicant nonetheless believes that one skilled in the art would be able to effectuate the gravity well model using this information and the detailed spring force model.

Similarly, the force-density model is described in the specification on page 7, line 12 to page 8, line 20. The specification on page 7, lines 6-11, indicates that there are a variety of other mechanical analogies that may be used to derive an appropriate force generation model (in addition to the spring force model and the gravity well model). The force-density model, as

described, is a general case description of the force generation model.

Applicant believes that the above changes and explanation answer the Examiner 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraphs 1 and 2, rejection of the claims, and respectfully requests withdrawal thereof.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by 
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611